

On relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany

Commentary published by
„Neues Deutschland“,
central organ of the Socialist
Unity Party of Germany
on 9 August 1976

C-89404

It long seemed that relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) were undergoing a process of normalization on the basis of the multilateral and bilateral treaties which had been concluded. The German Democratic Republic has produced ample proof of its readiness to make a constructive contribution to this effort, which serves the cause of peace, security and cooperation. Many good initiatives on the part of the German Democratic Republic could be listed to remind those in the Federal Republic who now believe that they are free to violate treaties in an arrogant fashion, to deprive them of their substance and to escape the obligations contained therein. This is especially true of the principle of the inviolability of frontiers and respect for the territorial integrity of states as laid down in the treaty signed with the Soviet Union in Moscow, the General Relations Treaty concluded with the GDR and the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

Commenting on the increasingly frequent provocations and attacks staged against the GDR's state border from the territory of the Federal Republic in flagrant violation of the Final Act, the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the GDR, Kurt Nier, said in a statement on 28 July he hoped the electoral campaign in the Federal Republic would not induce those involved to strain relations with the GDR too much. Regrettably, this statement on the part of the German Democratic Republic is not being taken seriously by the governing circles in the Federal Republic. During the past few weeks politicians in Bonn have gone as far as allowing all those a free hand who want to light a fuse by provocative violations of the GDR's state border and to turn the Federal Republic completely away from a policy of détente and normalization of relations with the German Democratic Republic.

The tragic chain of circumstances by which an Italian driver, a

friend of the GDR, regrettably lost his life at Hirschberg frontier crossing-point in mysterious conditions that remain to be cleared up, is now being shamelessly exploited by the FRG in an attempt to justify the persistent provocations committed by the FRG against the frontier of the German Democratic Republic and to sidetrack attention from the underlying causes and the instigators of such acts.

The statement made by the Federal Chancellor of the FRG on 28 July 1976 must be seen as a blanket vindication of all those who have for years staged provocations and violated the letter and spirit of the treaties concluded between the GDR and the FRG and the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. Predicably, the adversaries of the treaties and the enemies of détente gladly seized the carte blanche they had been given. It is important to state this here and now.

The anti-GDR campaign is now taking on dimensions for which the impending general elections can no longer serve as a pretext. Gross vilification of the German Democratic Republic and its representatives in the Federal Republic of Germany, bomb threats against these and the spread of falsehoods and slander to inflame the political atmosphere artificially are developments which will not benefit the Federal Republic as a whole through a shift in votes in favour of either side. The Federal Republic has to face the fact—whether it likes to or not—that when it was founded on 23 May 1949 this also meant that its eastern frontier was established in terms of international law. To renew the eastward drive would mean playing with fire, and this would benefit nobody.

No politician in the Federal Republic of Germany who claims to be taken seriously can escape responsibility for a development directed against the spirit of the treaties concluded and against common sense. Those who continually put forth, as official government policy, the revanchist proposition that the frontier between the GDR and the FRG is not a state frontier in terms of international law but a border similar to those existing between the *Länder* (states) of the FRG encourage violations of the GDR's state frontier and provocations in prohibited military zones and call the continuation of détente in question. Respect for the inviolability of existing frontiers in Europe is after all a decisive precondition for the further development of the Federal Republic's relations with all socialist countries.

With its statement of 28 July 1976 the Government of the Federal Republic finds itself in flagrant contradiction with the General

lations Treaty in which both sides, in the interests of establishing normal good-neighbourly relations, pledged "to respect the dependence and autonomy of either state in its internal and external affairs". The FRG Government, at its meeting on 28 July 76, by no manner of means abided by this commitment. On the contrary. Instead of living up to its obligations and determining ways of preventing frontier violations as they have been committed from the territory of the Federal Republic by bandits such as Gartenschläger or by misled and unreasonable persons, it is grossly interfering in affairs which, in accordance with the standards of international law, fully come within the jurisdiction of the German Democratic Republic. This is especially true of the violations in force along the frontier and in prohibited military zones.

While the German Democratic Republic has shown on more than one occasion that it is an outward-looking country and that it seeks to strengthen the foundations for normal relations with the Federal Republic of Germany, it has no intention of allowing the Federal Republic of Germany a say in this matter. Guided as it is by the standards of international law it does not claim for its part that it be granted the right to interfere in affairs of the Federal Republic such as the arming of the Bundeswehr and the Federal frontier force, the instructions they receive on the use of firearms, the numerous arrests made by FRG authorities at the Federal Republic's frontiers with other states or the carnage at Fürstfeldbruck where eleven Israeli athletes were murdered by sharpshooters of the Federal police force because Herr Genscher had broken his word.

Treaties are made to be honoured. It is necessary to say this in view of the persistent violations of treaties by the Federal Republic. It does not serve détente along the frontier if, under the cover of members of the Federal frontier force and the Federal police, demonstrations, pilgrimages, torch-light processions and school excursions to the state frontier of the German Democratic Republic are organized in a systematic effort to whip up feeling against the GDR, loudhailers being used to utter threats and insults against the GDR. All this is too reminiscent of the Nazis' notorious Heim ins Reich campaign to close one's eyes to it.

The fact that the public prosecutor in Lüneburg dropped charges against two citizens of the FRG, Müller and Kiese, who had destroyed frontier security installations and stolen GDR state property in late May 1976, and that the public prosecutor in

Lübeck made a similar decision raises the question as to what the Federal Republic considers appropriate to fulfil its obligations arising from bilateral and multilateral treaties. This applies not only to the observance of the principles of the inviolability of frontiers, respect for the territorial integrity of states, non-interference in internal affairs, and the sovereign equality of states. It applies just as much to the fulfilment of the obligations ensuing for both sides from the transit agreement, especially the need to prevent it being misused.

The current campaign to provoke hatred and strong feeling among the citizens of the FRG through inflammatory meetings and rabble-rousing speeches with a major part of the mass media also being involved—all this evoking memories of a period the spirit of which should not be resurrected—automatically gives rise to the question as to how the Federal Government thinks about the future patterns of travel and visits between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic.

In concluding the General Relations Treaty and supplementary agreements the Government of the German Democratic Republic was guided by the consideration that the gradual normalization of relations would also lead to contacts between people, which naturally presupposes respect for the legal and social system of the German Democratic Republic. Up to now 3.5 million citizens of the Federal Republic have visited the GDR annually and 1.4 million citizens of the GDR have visited the FRG each year. By and large, travel and visits on this scale have so far proceeded normally with neither side incurring any disadvantages and with quite a few Germans in the FRG forming a completely new image of the GDR. Systematic incitement, encouragement of hostile acts against the GDR and the upsurge of revenge-seeking forces in the Federal Republic compels us to consider whether it can be reasonably expected of the German Democratic Republic that it continue to grant citizens of the Federal Republic who have been incited in this way the same measure of freedom of movement they have so far enjoyed in the GDR.

A number of politicians in the Federal Republic, especially from the ranks of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and its Bavarian wing, the Christian Social Union (CSU), even went as far as to demand that economic pressure be brought to bear on the GDR to put more muscle into revanchist claims. It should be noted here that such attempts at blackmail will cut no ice with the German Democratic Republic. The people concerned obviously

overlook the fact that economic relations between the GDR and the FRG are advantageous to both sides. Substantial orders placed by the German Democratic Republic with firms in the FRG have enabled a sizable number of jobs to be saved in the Federal Republic.

Besides, the very same circles should know that the "dynamization" of the swing credit in the trade between the two countries, which has been limited rather than extended by the present Federal Government, dates from a time when a CDU Government was in office in the FRG. It is common knowledge that as early as during the negotiations on the General Relations Treaty the GDR expressed the view that a regular trade agreement should be concluded with the FRG and that the trusteeship committee (Treuhandstelle) should be dissolved. It is also well known that it is not interested in membership of the European Community with its advantages and disadvantages. Herr Kohl, a candidate for the chancellorship, should also bear this in mind. The encouragement given to an irresponsible chauvinistic campaign by leaders of the CDU-CSU throws an odd light on statements that after an election victory a CDU Government would respect the treaties concluded with East European countries and continue the policy of détente pursued by the current Federal Government towards the GDR and the other socialist countries.

It is characteristic of the FRG's information policy that the protest lodged by the GDR after the frontier provocation of 3 August 1976 is being passed over in silence while far-fetched lies and slanderous fabrications are used to escalate the unbridled smear campaign against the GDR and to stir up hatred. The apparent purpose is to conduct the election campaign in the FRG at the expense of the GDR in order to divert attention from domestic difficulties. But any such speculation is futile. It is to be hoped that common sense will prevail in the scramble for votes in the FRG and that the electorate will not enable the CDU-CSU, the party which advocates "returning the fire" in a manufactured incident like the one the Nazis staged at Gleiwitz, to form the next Federal Government. Considering the immoderateness of Strauss, Kohl, Carstens and company this could result in the already tainted democratic image of the Federal Republic being tarnished still further. As for the economic sanctions which Herr Kohl intends to impose on the GDR he can forget about them even now. They would not cause any substantial damage to the GDR but would cost further tens of thousands of FRG citizens their jobs.

Now what are the root causes underlying the current anti-GDR campaign in the FRG?

Firstly, the successful development of socialism in the German Democratic Republic and its indestructible ties with the Soviet Union and the other states of the socialist community.

Secondly, the growth of the reactionary and revenge-seeking forces in the Federal Republic and the aggravation of the class struggle brought on by the crisis gripping all capitalist countries.

Thirdly, the fact that realistically-minded forces in the parties represented in Parliament yield to the mounting pressure exerted by the revanchist forces.

The impressive record to which the 9th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany could refer and the magnificent prospects of socialism on German soil it laid out before the people have obviously caused panic and alarm among certain quarters in the Federal Republic. A well-orchestrated hate campaign using the whole arsenal of anti-communism has therefore been launched to distort the true image of socialism and of the socialist German Democratic Republic. They pull out all the stops to achieve their ends as the primitive and vicious defamation of our successful Olympic competitors proves once again.

The German Democratic Republic is in favour of continuing the policy of détente. It remains prepared to cultivate normal relations with the Federal Republic. But this requires common sense and goodwill on both sides. This should be kept in mind by those who by organizing or exploiting frontier provocations and wanton incitement to murder put objective obstacles in the way to genuinely healthy relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic.

The anti-GDR campaign in the Federal Republic and the useless attempt to give it international dimensions will not be to the benefit of the FRG. The earlier it is called off the better. Now as before, the German Democratic Republic is prepared to let common sense prevail. But it must be added that it has the means to prevent harm being done to itself and its citizens.

A. Z.

PEACE

Utopia,
Reality or
Challenge?

PANORAMA DDR

Written by Günter Leuschner

Publisher: PANORAMA DDR — Auslandspresseagentur GmbH
"First-hand information" department
DDR—1054 Berlin, Wilhelm Pieck Strasse 49
Editing completed in February 1977
Translated by Intertext Berlin
Verlag Zeit im Bild, DDR—801 Dresden, Julian Grimau Allee
Printed in the German Democratic Republic
by Graphischer Grossbetrieb Völkerfreundschaft Dresden
7151-2

Contents

Peace—Utopia, Reality or Challenge?	9
—What has been achieved so far?	11
—Three conclusions	14
Who profits from the results that have been scored?	16
—Changes in Europe	18
—Nothing will come about automatically	20
—First successes also in the sphere of disarmament	22
Peace and socialism belong together	25
—Initiatives launched by the socialist countries	26
—No motives for aggression	28
Durable détente through disarmament	30
—Two opposing views	31
—The strength of the peoples increases	33

Written by Günter Leuschner

**Publisher: PANORAMA DDR — Auslandspresseagentur GmbH
"First-hand information" department
DDR—1054 Berlin, Wilhelm Pieck Strasse 49
Editing completed in February 1977
Translated by Intertext Berlin
Verlag Zeit im Bild, DDR—801 Dresden, Julian Grimau Allee
Printed in the German Democratic Republic
by Graphischer Grossbetrieb Völkerfreundschaft Dresden
7151-2**

Contents

Peace—Utopia, Reality or Challenge?	9
—What has been achieved so far?	11
—Three conclusions	14
Who profits from the results that have been scored?	16
—Changes in Europe	18
—Nothing will come about automatically	20
—First successes also in the sphere of disarmament	22
Peace and socialism belong together	25
—Initiatives launched by the socialist countries	26
—No motives for aggression	28
Durable détente through disarmament	30
—Two opposing views	31
—The strength of the peoples increases	33

The disarmament programme of the socialist countries	36
—Reliable allies	38
—The importance of nuclear disarmament	39
—Conclusion of a treaty binding countries not to be the first to use nuclear weapons	41
—What is the contribution of NATO?	43
—Our proposals in other spheres of disarmament	46
—Disarmament in non-European regions	47
—World-wide renunciation of force	50
 What can we do for disarmament?	 53
—The volume of arms expenditures	54
—Can armament create new places of work?	56
—Whose interests are harmed by anti-communism?	57
—The broad movement of peace forces	59
—Steps to make peace more secure	61
—All possibilities should be used	62

At the time when the well-known Spanish painter Pablo Picasso created his Peace Dove, the world was just living through the period of the cold war. International relations were frosty and prospects for the future gloomy.

Much has changed since then and reason has more and more gained the upper hand. But the trenches of the cold war are not yet something belonging to the past once and for all. Mountains of weapons have been heaped up. The influence exerted by the exponents of expansion and of war profiteering has not yet been broken.

Nevertheless it must be stated that at no time in human history were conditions more favourable than now for making mankind's millennium-old desire for ever-lasting peace come true. Preserving peace has become the key task of peace-loving forces throughout the world.

Peace— Utopia, Reality or Challenge?

All statesmen and politicians claim to be desirous of peace, of nothing else than peace. There is no declaration of intent and no party programme containing a call for the preparation of an attack against other countries. As for the contents of speeches and programmes, peace should have prevailed throughout the whole world for many years. Facts, however, tell quite a different story.

Incidentally, a whole continent, namely Europe, has experienced 32 years without war. This is but a short span of time in the history of mankind. But for this war-stricken continent—two world wars raged on it during this century—it is very important that two generations were born into, and grew up under, peaceful conditions.

That Europe of all continents has become a centre of a promising new beginning is another proof of how the political scenery has changed here. The community of socialist countries rallied around the Soviet Union came into being after the victory over German fascism. Committed as this community is to social justice, progress and

peace, as its most important political task, it has become the force which gives the essential impulse to bringing about a change in the political climate.

In the meantime, reasonably-minded bourgeois politicians in capitalist countries have likewise taken notice of the fact that the new constellation of forces is lasting, that attempts to reverse it by force have become futile, that the time has come for seriously examining the proposals which the socialist countries repeatedly submitted on détente and peaceful coexistence and for discussing ways and means of their realization. Thus peace ceased to be a Utopia, something illusory.

Peace in Europe has become more secure although it seems not yet to be durable for all times to come. Potential hotbeds of war continued to exist in other continents. The situation in the Middle East remains tense. The existence of fascist and racist regimes in Latin America and in the south of Africa still involve the danger of grave international conflicts. In Europe itself, the arms race is carried on, with several countries even having considerably escalated it most recently. In a number of western countries which signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe,—such as the USA, the Federal Republic of Germany and other NATO states—politicians demanded record armament budgets and their parliaments consented to their demand. NATO has trebled the number and the dimensions of its military manoeuvres over the last three years.

What has been achieved so far? .

A contradiction which has existed over a prolonged period has thus become even more apparent during the last few months. On the one hand, international treaties and agreements concluded in recent years and, particularly, the historic decisions of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, represent a measure of political détente unparalleled in European history during the past few decades. On the other hand, however, armament production is in full swing and heaps of ever more dangerous and costly weapons are being piled up. Leonid I. Brezhnev stated late in December 1976 in an interview with the American journalist Mr. Kingsbury-Smith:

“I cannot but say that we in the Soviet Union are astonished at the attitude displayed by some circles in the West—in the USA and other NATO states. They behave as if nothing had happened over the last few years, as if nothing had been changed and as if the world still found itself in the period of the cold war. They are launching one noisy campaign after the other on an allegedly mounting ‘military threat’ on the part of the USSR. They demand ever higher expenditures on military purposes and intensify the arms race.”

“We hold that things cannot go on in this way. By enforcing political détente we have paved the way for tackling the key issues concerning the limitation of armaments and disarmament.”

To be sure, an unbiased observer who watched the political scenery in Europe and the USA in 1976 must have gained a contradictory picture. The new Five-Year Plan period began in all socialist countries last year. The Congresses of these countries' communist parties discussed new economic and social tasks the fulfilment of which requires a great lot of money and vast material potentials. These Congresses also adopted foreign-policy programmes of action fully and completely geared to stabilizing political détente and to putting an end to the arms race.

In the summer of 1976, the representatives of 29 communist and workers' parties of Europe met in Berlin, capital of the GDR, who in the programme of action adopted by them also gave pride of place to the struggle for disarmament. In autumn last year, Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko submitted to the United Nations General Assembly a memorandum on disarmament which contained many concrete proposals in this sphere and which largely determined the UN disarmament debate. Last but not least, the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty organization, at their Bucharest meeting held at the end of 1976, once again made constructive proposals, all of which aim at the continued implementation of the Helsinki decisions and at ending the arms race. When the reader moreover considers that the Soviet Union is the only great power which reduced its military budget for 1977 by 200 million to reach 17,200 million roubles while

the USA increased it by 13 per cent to total 100,000 million dollars in the same period he will be well put into the picture.

In line with the decisions of Helsinki, the socialist countries are willing to take advantage of the level reached in political détente and make the indispensable next step—the step towards disarmament. This is the basic trend in the entire socialist part of the European continent. Even the most critical observer will be unable to find the slightest indication of war hysteria, glorification of the arms race, a pessimistic attitude towards détente or doubts about the usefulness of pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence. Should it really be possible that parties and governments which so unambiguously and consistently work to bring about stable peace and to educate hundreds of millions of people in this spirit nourish aggressive ambitions as is asserted by certain propagandists?

Unfortunately, the unprejudiced observer of the political scenery was not able to gain such an unambiguous picture in the USA and some West European countries. Needless to stress that there too the vast majority of people have the same desire for peace and security as elsewhere in the world. But this desire was, at least temporarily, burried by a noisy campaign launched to spread doubts regarding the usefulness of the policy of détente. And there were and continue to be demands for a return to the period of the cold war. An arms race psychosis was stirred up, the old fairytale of the “Soviet threat” spread in diverse

forms and election campaigns were held under slogans that are hardly in accord with the decisions of Helsinki.

Three conclusions

At least three conclusions can be drawn from this contradiction which burdened the policy of peaceful coexistence during the year after the Helsinki Conference:

1. The turn effected from confrontation to détente and peaceful coexistence held out against any attempt to push Europe back into the political conditions prevailing in the 1950s and 1960s.
2. There is no smooth road, no automatic transition from political to military détente, from the Helsinki Conference to putting an end to the arms race. It is rather a road of struggle and fierce controversy with the forces opposed to disarmament.
3. In the period following the Helsinki Conference not all politicians and statesmen have consistently and in any situation come out against the attacks launched by the opponents of détente. For this reason, and primarily because disarmament is the first and basic concern of mankind, this question cannot be left to the discretion of politicians alone.

Any statesman who really has the safeguarding of peace by way of disarmament at heart and considers this to be his most important task should be satisfied if he received

broadest possible and active support from citizens, from social forces of all political leanings. Shouldn't, on the other hand, doubts crop up as to the sincerity of party leaders', ministers' or diplomats' efforts for peace when they reject the support of the masses of the people or find it inconvenient? This is unthinkable in the GDR and the other socialist countries. They are rather convinced that the political struggle for disarmament can only be successful with the active participation of the greatest possible number of organizations, parties, federations, citizens' initiatives, trade unions, youth organizations and individuals, through their joint action, irrespective of differences in opinion on other questions. This is also the reason why we reject the pessimism and fatalism deliberately spread at some places to sow doubts concerning the usefulness of the policy of détente, doubts concerning the possibility of ending the arms race and to prevent people from helping to bring about a really durable and reliable order of peace. The balance-sheet of what has been achieved so far tends to make us optimistic rather than pessimistic.

Who profits from the results that have been scored?

Foreign-policy events can, of course, be judged from different angles. The end to the war in Vietnam, for instance, can be considered a defeat of the USA. The same event can, however, be looked upon as one which put an end to the immeasurable suffering of millions of people, which enabled the peoples of Indochina to start a new life in peace and allowed the whole of Asia to sigh with relief, which, for the American people, was no defeat either, but put an end to the blood-shed, which was a victory of those forces all over the world who for many years had come out for peace in Vietnam in an unprecedented international solidarity movement. Whether an event is considered as a defeat or a victory depends on the angle from which things are judged and analysed. A politician used to think in imperialist terms of power politics will regard something as a defeat which dedicated advocates of peace would celebrate as a victory. Most people will not find it hard to make the correct decision in favour of peace

and, in actual fact, the victory won by the Vietnamese people was also a victory for all champions of peace, an event having a beneficial effect on the policy of détente.

The proponents of power politics ignore such obvious conclusions. After the war in Vietnam they maintained that the events in Angola had adversely affected détente. But the contrary holds true. Owing to the fact that the socialist countries rendered support to the legitimate Angolan government in the face of foreign intervention it was possible to prevent a lengthy war in Angola, a war which could have resulted in unforeseeable international implications, which, without doubt, would have burdened seriously the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Or let us take South Africa. Nobody will have the face to assert that the demands of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia for freedom and self-determination and that the anti-Apartheid struggle waged by the oppressed black population against Vorster's regime burdens peace or détente. If the situation in this region is fraught with danger for the African continent then these dangers have their roots in racism and in the terror regimes of Vorster and Smith. From this follows that the impending final elimination of racism and colonialism and the implementation of relevant resolutions passed by the United Nations will be of benefit to all peoples and enhance the further spread of the policy of détente. It is said with good reason that peace is indivisible. Hence, logically, the struggle against the peace-endangering racist and colonial-

ist policy of oppression must form part and parcel of the fight for world-wide peace. The elimination of the hotbed of war in Southeast Asia, the freedom of countries which were formerly under Portuguese colonial rule, as well as the foreseeable elimination of the last colonial and racist bastions in Africa are successes over which all peace-loving people in the world cannot but rejoice.

Changes in Europe

Changes are most eloquent in Europe. The fact that the danger of a disastrous nuclear war which would destroy large parts of our globe is substantially smaller today than ten or fifteen years ago is first and foremost due to the changes in relations between the Soviet Union and the USA and the advances made in the sphere of security and cooperation in Europe. Erich Honecker, Chairman of the GDR's Council of State said in his New Year's address 1977:

“Our continent has started to play a role in international life which differs completely from that it played in the past when imperialist policy of aggression triggered off devastating world wars. If we succeeded in adding new decades of peace to those lying behind us this would have an effect on the international development of peace and human progress that cannot be valued highly enough.”

When in the summer of 1975 the leading statesmen of 35 countries affixed their signatures to the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference they were all well aware of the importance this document has for the future of our continent. So it is all the less understandable why certain propagandists, immediately after the event, tried to make people believe that the Conference and the policy of European détente was of benefit to a few countries only.

The Helsinki Conference was primarily a success of the European peace movement, of the persistent, patient and self-sacrificing work done by thousands upon thousands of people in dozens of countries, who finally enforced their will to put an end to the cold war in the face of resistance, doubts and resignation. Anybody who knows how hard this time was, with what energy the socialist countries fought to overcome the cold war and with what untiring commitment communists, socialists and Christians worked for this aim, had reason enough to defend the results of this tough struggle against the enemies of détente. The more so because the period after the Helsinki Conference showed that it is in fact possible to translate the outcome of this meeting into practical reality and thus to forge ahead along the road of cooperation.

Dozens of treaties and agreements have been concluded since then on the basis of the Helsinki Conference. Regular political consultations between governments were intensified and the network of new relations became

closer. Economic relations developed continuously, and while goods exchanges between the western industrialized countries stagnated during the years of the crisis growth rates in East-West trade remained at a high level.

Nothing will come about automatically

Progress has also been made in implementing the principles laid down in Basket 3 of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference although the attacks of the enemies of détente had a particularly stunting effect in this field. In 1976, for instance, more than 4,500 journalists from 65 countries' of which 1,800 from West European countries, including the Federal Republic of Germany and West Berlin visited the GDR. The number of correspondents permanently accredited in our country has increased to 129. (Also see the brochure "Helsinki—what next?", published by PANORAMA DDR—ed.).

To be sure, we have only just begun to implement the comprehensive programme of Helsinki. We would be very glad if some points could be realized more swiftly. But the socialist countries have also warned from the very beginning against the illusion that the Final Act of Helsinki in its entirety can be implemented "automatically", i. e., without political struggle. Nobody has forgotten the stubborn efforts made by influential political forces in some countries until shortly before the signing of the Act so as

to thwart the decisions of the Conference. It would have been naive to think that these circles stopped their activities as of 1 August 1975.

With their attacks against the accords of Helsinki, the opponents of détente in Europe have rather furnished proof of the fact that their only alternative is a return to the period of the cold war. This, however, is no acceptable, no humane, but an extremely dangerous alternative. The controversy going on in the West about the meaning of détente can thus, in the final analysis, make it even clearer to the peoples of Europe and the USA how beneficial it is to all of us that the principles of peaceful coexistence are beginning to gain acceptance on our continent.

It is common knowledge that the capitalist countries are currently faced with complex economic problems and will probably also be so in the future. This leads to unemployment and economic deterioration of various kinds for millions of citizens. It is easy to imagine that these burdens would weigh still more heavily, that problems would be more serious if the permanent capitalist crisis coincided with a time of dangerous political tension, of balancing on the brink of war or a time without extensive economic relations with the socialist countries.

The social and economic contradictions inherent in capitalism cannot be eliminated through a policy of détente, but it has contributed towards alleviating their consequences on the working population to a certain

extent. The effect could even be more pronounced if the West showed greater readiness to deal with the disarmament proposals of the socialist countries. A ten-per cent reduction in the military spending, as suggested by the Soviet Union, would mean setting free 30,000 million dollars (current armament expenditures totalling 300,000 million dollars) per annum that could be used to extend support to the developing countries, to create new places of work or for social welfare purposes.

First successes also in the sphere of disarmament

Very much remains to be done in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. But, nevertheless, the balance-sheet of what has been achieved so far is by no means as negative as sometimes pretended. Here are a few examples:

- The Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water was concluded as early as 1963. Later on, the Soviet Union and the USA also agreed drastically to reduce nuclear weapon tests underground.
- Roughly 100 countries signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons concluded in 1968. There is no doubt that without this treaty the number of countries possessing nuclear weapons and hence the danger of war using such weapons would be greater by far.

- Agreements have been concluded prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed, the ocean-floor and the subsoil thereof, on celestial bodies, in outer space and in the Antarctic.
- There exists an international convention banning the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) weapons. One of the three types of weapons of mass destruction has thus already been excluded and negotiations have been conducted since long on the prohibition of chemical weapons, with a chance of a successful outcome in the near future.
- Negotiations between the USSR and the USA, including the SALT talks, have brought results over the past few years which carry weight not only in the relations of these two countries. These results include the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, the first SALT Agreement on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War.
- When speaking about the first successes scored, mention should also be made of the fact that the 31st session of the UN General Assembly decided to hold a special UN meeting in 1978 which—for the first time in the history of the United Nations Organization—will exclusively be devoted to problems of disarmament.

We will not discuss in detail here as to whether all parties

concerned have done everything in their power over the past few years to preserve mankind from the danger of war. But what has been said here proves incontestably that it is possible to make strides ahead in a sphere as complex as military détente if the required preparedness is shown. The benefit of these modest initial results for the people—regardless of where they live—is clear for everybody to see. Nobody can say whether it would be possible for Europe to live in peace in 1977 without these successes in the field of political and military détente.

Peace and socialism belong together

Any success scored so far in the sphere of political and military détente is the achievement of many people. The documents of the Helsinki Conference contain the signatures of statesmen from socialist and from capitalist countries. The SALT treaties were concluded between great powers belonging to differing social systems. It would have been impossible to conclude a single one of these treaties without the cooperation of realistically-minded circles in the bourgeois camp. Hundreds of thousands of trade unionists, scientists, artists, Christians, people from all walks of life have actively helped reduce the danger of nuclear war.

If we, nevertheless, want to speak here of the role played by the socialist countries in the struggle for peace, we, of course, do not mean to ignore or belittle the efforts of any other country which contributed to bringing about this enormous process of change in international relations. We could even do without mentioning it if there was not a

number of countries that made the attitude of communists towards peace and their share in what has so far been achieved the object of malicious slander and anti-communist campaigns.

Moreover, it is important to know for those who want to do more in the interests of peace than talk of their love of peace where they can find their most reliable and strongest allies, irrespective of diverging opinions on other questions. It is incontestable that the socialist countries, owing to the character of their social system and their political, economic and military strength, are the best organized and most powerful force of peace in the world.

Initiatives launched by the socialist countries

It cannot be denied that the socialist countries have worked for decades to bring about an atmosphere characterized by reason and normalized relations between the socialist and the capitalist countries, as finally laid down in the early 1970s in a form binding under international law in the well-known treaties of Moscow, Warsaw and Prague, in the Basic Relations Treaty between the GDR and the FRG and the Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin.

It cannot be denied that the Conference in Helsinki was held thanks to the initiative taken by the socialist countries which had for many years tried to persuade other countries to understand the necessity and to accept this idea.

It cannot be denied that the socialist countries were and are the most consistent fighters for the elimination of hotbeds of war in Indochina or of those still existing in the Middle East, for the elimination of racism and colonialism, not only because of the social injustice inherent in them but also because of the danger of war emanating from them.

It cannot be denied that the socialist countries defended the policy of détente most uncompromisingly at times when in other countries the opponents of détente, doubters and pessimists seemed to have the whip hand in the political arena. It is unthinkable that journalists, politicians or the military in the Soviet Union, the GDR and the other socialist countries come out against the policy of peaceful co-existence or even demand a return to the cold war. The entire political education and information of the people at school, through the mass media, parties and organizations are designed to make peace stable. We do not want to hurt the feelings of any country—but which state, except for the socialist, can say this with the same unlimited absoluteness?

It cannot be denied, last but not least, that it is only the socialist countries which have a comprehensive concept for disarmament and have declared the struggle to safeguard peace to be the priority task in their foreign policy for all times to come.

In his well-received speech on current foreign-policy questions L. I. Brezhnev stated in Tula in January 1977:

“No other country, besides the Soviet Union, has submitted to mankind such a comprehensive, concrete and realistic programme for the reduction and, as a second step, for the complete elimination of the danger of a new war . . .”

“The proposals tabled by the Soviet Union and its friends receive the support of dozens of states in the United Nations Organization and of the masses of the people on all continents.”

No motives for aggression

These and other facts are, of course, no coincidence. Their existence cannot be ascribed to citizens in the socialist countries being more “peace-loving” than elsewhere. They are rather the result and the consequence of objective conditions in our social system. Throughout human history wars and aggressions were caused by the striving for economic and political power, profiteering or attempts to overcome crises within the country by way of military expansion.

Such motives are non-existent in socialist society. There are no people in our countries who would draw profit from war or from the arms race. Without military spending which is still necessary under the given conditions we would be able to realize our economic and social welfare projects even more swiftly. Our Five-Year

Plans, with their ambitious targets, can only be implemented in peace. It is no secret what tremendous tasks the socialist countries have posed themselves for the period by 1980 and beyond. Certainly, we proceed from the assumption that the entire earth will be socialist some day, and we think that history must follow this course objectively. But speeding this process up by way of military means would be an adventurous, a criminal undertaking directed against the humanistic concern of our scientific world outlook. It is no coincidence that it were the communists who always and everywhere brought the greatest sacrifices in restoring or preserving peace.

There are many facts proving that socialism can flourish best in conditions of peace. It is only in peace that it can furnish proof of the advantages inherent in it and of its social character. We do not claim foreign territories or the riches of other nations. We need peace now and in the future to prosper. And for this reason there can be no reasonable alternative for socialism to the policy of peaceful coexistence. It is the best, the most favourable form of the two systems' life alongside each other as long as differing social systems exist on our globe.

Durable détente through disarmament

The Austrian Foreign Minister Pahr said in a recent interview that “détente without disarmament remains incredible”. Is he right? Everybody will agree with what he said when considering that the policy of détente first and foremost aims at creating 100-per-cent guarantees for the maintenance of peace. There will be no guaranteed security nor really reliable peace unless the arms race is ended. The continued existence of the contradiction between political détente on the one hand and the arms race on the other will in the long run endanger what has been achieved in Europe over the past few years. The inter-connection between détente and disarmament is so obvious that two conclusions must be drawn from it:

1. One’s attitude towards the necessary ending of the arms race is the criterion of one’s attitude toward peace and détente in general. Anybody behaving as if there was no such contradiction between détente and the arms race, ignoring it and doing nothing to eliminate it must allow people to ask what he understands by a policy of détente and how credible his statements are—to take up

the idea of the Austrian Foreign Minister.

2. All those working for disarmament with all their strength do not only aim at continuing the policy of détente but at expanding it and thus making the results of the positive change in Europe secure.

Two opposing views

The socialist countries are guided by these ideas in their foreign policy. Their attitude is probably most strikingly expressed in the following sentences from the Declaration adopted by the recent session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty organization which took place in Bucharest in November 1976:

“To stop the arms race and carry out disarmament, in the first place nuclear disarmament, and to remove the threat of a new world war are the most acute and urgent tasks of our time. Without this it is impossible to make positive tendencies in the development of international relations truly irreversible, it is impossible to ensure genuine security in the world.”

It is regrettable, but perhaps also characteristic, that this central idea of the Bucharest session, which runs like a red thread through the entire declaration, has been concealed by the greater part of bourgeois mass media, and probably not by chance. An objective presentation of our

attitude towards the arms race would reveal that it is diametrically opposed to the policy pursued by NATO to this day.

The socialist countries maintain that a consistent policy of détente rules out the arms race.

NATO insists on the doctrine that there cannot be détente without military strength. Hence, détente does include the arms race. It is even to become the “pre-condition” for maintaining peace.

No further comment is needed to make it clear that these are two completely different basic attitudes towards the arms race and, consequently, towards disarmament. Although it must be stated that NATO no longer rejects the policy of peaceful coexistence and that official NATO communiques have no longer excluded negotiations on arms limitation in recent times. NATO has had to make concessions to the changed international situation and to the will of their countries' population. Their basic attitude towards the arms race, however, has not changed.

An appropriate military strength is *still a necessary* condition for the socialist countries to reliably protect the security and the peaceful work of their peoples, which they would like to replace, as soon as possible, by better, more reliable and cheaper conditions, i. e., by mutual and controlled disarmament. For NATO, military strength is an *absolute* term and the policy of the “equilibrium of terror” is still considered there the ultimate in the safeguarding of peace.

Addressing the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, Leonid I. Brezhnev said with regard to this concept back in 1973:

“I do not think that any of us would be satisfied with a peace that is based, as before, on a ‘balance of fear’. That kind of peace would differ but little from the cold war. It would be a ‘cold peace’ that could easily revert to a situation of tense confrontation oppressive to the consciousness and life of the peoples, and fraught with the danger of a world-wide conflict.”

Are not the events in some western countries after the Helsinki Conference indicative of how great the danger of a setback is if the chance offered by political détente is not used systematically and energetically in order to achieve military détente? Are not some discussions in the west on the continuation of the policy of détente characterized by that “cold peace” which can quite easily revert into a confrontation?

The strength of the peoples increases

The history of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is at the same time the history of these countries' disarmament proposals. The Soviet Union submitted detailed graduated programmes for general and

complete disarmament to the public as early as 1922 in Genoa, in the early thirties to the then League of Nations and then once again at the beginning of the 1960s. All these proposals met with the fiercest resistance on the part of the western countries. The idea of disarmament could not be realized over a long period of time owing to the general political climate and the relations of forces prevailing at the time.

Now the situation has changed. The policy of peaceful coexistence has introduced a turn in international relations, at least in Europe. By signing the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference 35 countries have undertaken to introduce measures with a view to obtaining general and complete disarmament under strict and effective control.

Peace in Indochina has created better conditions for transforming Asia into a zone of peace. The influence exerted by the developing countries on world politics has increased visibly and they are objectively interested in world-wide disarmament. This is the only way for the third-world countries to solve their giant economic and social problems. The costs of the arms race have in the meantime reached such an enormous volume that they have undermined the currency systems even of the richest capitalist countries and resulted in ever greater economic and social burdens. The influence of the armament lobby on the politics of countries such as the USA and the Federal Republic of Germany still continues to be considerable but the resistance of part of the business world

is growing against the military-industrial complex which is oriented towards armament profits and expansion.

The passive attitude vis-a-vis the realities of the nuclear age when every military conflict can escalate into a nuclear catastrophe is on a decrease. The striving of the peoples for peace, for banning military confrontation and the danger of war from international life is assuming ever greater weight. Never before in the history of mankind have so many international negotiations been conducted and so many-faceted proposals on disarmament been submitted. Never before have people felt so clearly that a world without weapons is no longer a Utopia, but a real aim that can well be obtained although with tremendous efforts. The socialist countries want to make use of this chance with all their strength and in concert with all peoples, countries and governments which are prepared to join in. They want that a world without weapons ceases to be a Utopia and becomes a reality. That is the reason why they consider disarmament to be the most important task of our time.

The disarmament programme of the socialist countries

The socialist community is the only group of countries which has drawn up a comprehensive, logically arranged programme for the gradual transition from the arms race to complete and controlled disarmament. This programme takes account of the complexity of the disarmament problem which comprises a multitude of complicated military and political elements. It considers the fact that it is impossible for various reasons to make one radical step in order to leave behind the arms race and arrive at a world without weapons. A step-by-step approach, as suggested by the socialist countries, does not mean that the communists are not prepared to take comprehensive disarmament measures when all parties concerned are ready to do so. Referring to this question Leonid I. Brezhnev stated before the CPSU Central Committee in October 1976:

“We are prepared to introduce measures for disarmament even as of tomorrow—regardless of whether

they are comprehensive, radical or at least partial measures to begin with—on a profoundly just foundation and on the basis of mutuality. As for us we will do our best.”

It goes without saying that the principle underlying our disarmament programme is that of mutuality and equivalence of disarmament measures, with full observance of the security interests of all states and peoples. As long as the world lives on mountains of weapons, as long as mistrust continues to exist and is being stirred up artificially and as long as aggressive forces in different parts of the world are playing with the idea of employing the stockpiled weapons we do not expect anybody to make unilateral concessions in advance in the field of disarmament nor are we prepared to reduce our defence potential unilaterally. What matters is that disarmament must become a general issue in all countries without exception.

When peace is indivisible, then disarmament must likewise be indivisible. This does not mean, however, that the solution of disarmament problems for certain regions, for instance Europe, or concerning certain types of weapons in the hands of only a few countries, for instance weapons of mass destruction, could not or rather should not occupy an important place in the struggle to end the arms race. The permanent members of the UN Security Council (the USSR, the USA, Great Britain, France and the People's

Republic of China) have a particularly high share in the annual expenditures on armament and also bear an especially great responsibility for the safeguarding of peace.

With this fact in mind, the UN General Assembly approved of a Soviet proposal three years ago to the effect that these countries should reduce their military spending by ten per cent and make part of the funds saved in this way available to the developing countries. Considering the fact that, on an international scale, one million dollars is spent on military purposes every two minutes one can clearly imagine the volume of the funds which would be set free as a result. Unfortunately, most of the members of the Security Council are not yet prepared to adopt this proposal.

Reliable allies

We also proceed from the assumption that a task as complex as that concerning general and complete disarmament can by no means be left to diplomats and politicians alone. Genuinely great projects affecting the destiny of mankind as a whole were always realized with the active cooperation of the peoples. And this will be so in the future as well. Although the socialist countries, their policy and their influence on world affairs are the most powerful driving force in the field of disarmament, the emergence of a world-wide popular movement fighting for this aim is becoming a matter of crucial importance.

Recent history furnishes sufficient proof of the peoples' strength. The international solidarity movement to end the war in Indochina represented, as we know today, a substantial factor in the elimination of this dangerous hotbed of war. And the peoples' movement in Europe figured prominently in bringing about and holding the security conference in Helsinki. World-wide disarmament, however, is a much more complicated task to be fulfilled by mankind. Eliminating the danger of war once and for all will be impossible without the active cooperation of broad social forces from all countries on our earth, without the masses of the people.

Energetic action by all countries, all political and social forces who are aware of their responsibility for the present and future generations is necessary so as to achieve new successes in the fulfilment of this historic task. All forces really willing to take part in the preparation and implementation of campaigns to end the arms race and for disarmament will have reliable and faithful allies in the socialist countries and their peoples.

The importance of nuclear disarmament

The questions of nuclear disarmament are the central idea of the declaration adopted by the members of the Warsaw Treaty organization at their session in Bucharest in November 1976. The declaration contains the dis-

armament proposals of the 25th CPSU Congress, the congresses of the other socialist countries' parties as well as of the Berlin conference of European communist and workers' parties. We do not consider conventional disarmament to be a task of secondary importance, but we think that a war employing weapons of mass destruction represents the gravest danger to all peoples and nations.

That is why we work for an end to the nuclear arms race, for a reduction and liquidation of nuclear weapons and for a complete ban on all nuclear weapons tests by all countries.

Negotiations on partial steps in the field of nuclear disarmament are being conducted between the USA and the Soviet Union, in the United Nations Organization and in the Geneva Disarmament Committee. Mention should also be made in this connection of the discussions regarding the *prohibition of new weapons of mass destruction and of chemical weapons*. We know from the press that the USA is developing chemical compounds whose destructive power is equivalent to that of nuclear weapons. Finally there exist blueprints and plans for the development of completely new weapons of mass destruction which would exceed all weapons known so far. Since it is easier to ban weapons which are not yet being produced the socialist countries attach great importance to the conclusion of an agreement in this sphere.

The Nuclear Weapons Non-proliferation Treaty which

was put into force several years ago played a decisive role in preventing the group of nuclear powers and thus the danger of nuclear war from increasing. But there are countries, and even nuclear powers, which have not yet acceded to this treaty. It is, however, necessary that all countries become parties to this accord not least because growing international trade in nuclear material (for nuclear power stations for instance) increases the danger that this material is misused for military purposes. And it is not a matter of pure chance that treaties concluded by the Federal Republic of Germany with Brazil and South Africa on the supply of nuclear installations have aroused the attention and suspicion of world public opinion.

**Conclusion of a treaty binding countries
not to be the first to use nuclear weapons**

The socialist countries have also tabled the necessary political proposals on nuclear disarmament. Their implementation is to prevent the employment of nuclear weapons and to create the political conditions for the final liquidation of all weapons of this type. Proposals in this sphere include those submitted in Bucharest on the conclusion of a treaty in which all countries which participated in the Conferences on Security and Cooperation in Europe pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against one another.

This proposal met with great response in Europe, but was rejected by NATO. This attitude is a result of the pressure exerted by the most aggressive circles within NATO and was rightly criticized also by bourgeois politicians. George Kennan, one of the most experienced US specialists in foreign-policy issues, stated in an interview with the British "Guardian" that it was wrong to reject the proposal of the Warsaw Treaty organization without at least having discussed it.

What had the socialist countries in mind when they made this proposal which, irrespective of the hasty rejection by NATO, will of course continue to be a subject of negotiation? The danger of nuclear war is the greatest in Europe merely because the largest amounts of weapons of mass destruction are stockpiled on this continent. A European nuclear war would necessarily affect all countries, nuclear and non-nuclear power alike. The prevention of nuclear war in Europe would, on the other hand, free the countries not possessing nuclear weapons, i. e., the majority of European states, from the threat of nuclear blackmail. Their political situation would thus be improved. For this reason, the proposal is addressed to all countries which participated in the Helsinki Conference.

At the same time our continent offers the most favourable conditions for effecting a prohibition of the first use of nuclear weapons, as all European countries accepted, in Helsinki, a catalogue of ten principles and solemnly

pledged to observe norms guaranteeing the security of our continent. These ten principles also include one prohibiting the use of force and the threat to use force. The obligation of countries not to be the first to employ nuclear weapons against one another is thus in full accord with the principle providing for the renunciation of force, it complements this principle and makes it more concrete.

It should also be recalled that in Vienna complex negotiations have been conducted for many years on the reduction of troops and armaments in Central Europe. Needless to stress that these negotiations also cover the reduction of nuclear weapons stockpiled in the area. Everybody will understand that a ban on such weapons would render the Vienna negotiations less complicated.

What is the contribution of NATO?

Viewed from this angle, NATO's reasons for rejecting our proposals appear to be ungrounded and questionable. First of all, the leadership body of this military pact expressly declares that it cannot and will not renounce being the first side to use nuclear weapons in Europe in the event of war. This confession with all its consequences means that NATO generals really play with the thought of a nuclear war during which, first and foremost, the densely populated western part of Europe would completely be destroyed.

What an insanity! The true plans of NATO staffs have hardly ever been admitted so openly. How will NATO bring this attitude towards nuclear war into agreement with the principle of the non-use of force, as contained in the Final Act of Helsinki, and with the declaration adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1961 on the prohibition of the employment of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons? This declaration states that the use of such weapons contradicts the spirit, letter and aims of the United Nations Organization, contradicts the norms of international law and is a crime against humanity and against civilization. The only motive for NATO's attitude consisted in the assertion that it had to protect itself against the "conventional superiority" of the socialist countries in the event an attack being launched by these countries.

This assertion is dishonest in more than one respect. First, NATO accuses the socialist countries of nourishing aggressive intentions, for which there exists not the slightest indication. In his interview with the British "Guardian", the American politician George Kennan also said that there had been no moment since 1948 at which the Russians had seriously considered, or wanted, to invade Western Europe.

This unambiguous statement by George Kennan and many other bourgeois politicians is another corroboration of historical facts and underlines that it is mere slander when the Soviet Union of all countries is accused of

having aggressive intentions—a country which at no time in its history has started a war, which was attacked by German fascism, brought the greatest sacrifices in the Second World War and has worked for peace all the time in the sixty years of its existence.

Second, the justification used by NATO contains the old lie of the Soviet Union's "military superiority" with which it wants to halt progress in the field of disarmament now as before. On the occasion of Carter's inauguration the former and the new President as well as the former and the new Foreign Minister made statements on this subject in which they spoke of the "military superiority of the USA" or at least of the great powers' equality in the military field. Last but not least, the talk of an allegedly "enormous asymmetry" has been refuted by the concrete figures which the socialist countries submitted in Vienna on the strength of their troops.

Third, NATO produces the impression that the socialist countries leave conventional weapons out of consideration in their disarmament proposals and thus want to obtain advantages for themselves. This has nothing to do with truth. The proposals concerning the ban on the first use of nuclear weapons is but one link in the chain of our disarmament proposals which cover the gradual elimination of conventional weapons and of nuclear weapons alike. The attitude displayed by NATO towards this proposal of the socialist countries thus reflects the basic attitude of this pact to the nuclear arms race in general.

While the socialist countries tabled a comprehensive programme whose implementation would rule out wars employing means of mass destruction on an international scale, some western countries hesitate to approach the problem of nuclear disarmament. Hesitation and resistance, however, have resulted in not as much headway having been made in this sphere as was possible.

Our proposals in other spheres of disarmament

Alongside nuclear disarmament, the programme recently outlined in the Bucharest Declaration, contains a great number of other measures all of which contribute towards gradually ending the arms race fully and completely. Mention should first be made of the *Vienna talks on the reduction of troops and armaments in Central Europe*. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries consider these negotiations particularly important because they would introduce *genuine* disarmament in a region exposed to special danger. Together with the results in political détente achieved after the Helsinki Conference, successes in Vienna could considerably further improve the situation in Europe.

Of course, we do not underrate the difficulties that must be overcome so as to arrive at a reduction of troops in Central Europe, with the principle of equal security for all parts involved being strictly observed. But if several

years of negotiations have not produced tangible results this cannot be ascribed to the complexity of the subject alone. In the course of these negotiations, the socialist countries have been prepared to make many a compromise and they will continue to do everything in their power to reach an agreement acceptable to all. Swifter progress could be made in Vienna, if really all parties concerned respected the principle of equal security, were not out to arrive at unilateral advantages and did not persist in the members of the Warsaw Treaty organization reducing their armed forces almost three times as much as NATO, if the main issue of negotiations was not the reduction of a few weapons and the troops of a few countries but of all without exception.

In recent months, politicians of western countries indicated that they were prepared to show greater understanding for the principle of equal security and to reconsider unrealistic concepts. We would be very satisfied if such considerations found reflection in constructive proposals to be submitted in Vienna and would undoubtedly give a constructive answer to a revision of unsuitable points of view.

Disarmament in non-European regions

Disarmament measures for certain regions outside Europe would contribute to strengthening security on the entire

globe in the same way as would the world-wide reduction of troops equipped with conventional weapons.

The Bucharest Declaration therefore also states that the member-countries of the Warsaw Treaty

“attach great importance to the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, to new world-wide efforts for the dismantling of military bases on foreign territories and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other states, for the creation of peace zones in various regions and for the reduction of the military budgets of states.”

The Declaration of Bucharest takes also into account that dangers to peace do not emanate from Europe alone. The trend to the arms race has spread to other continents, for instance, Latin America, Asia and even Africa, as was borne out in recent years. The continued existence of the hotbed of war in the Middle East encourages this trend as do the plans of the Pentagon for the creation of a so-called South-Atlantic Pact, the installation of a chain of foreign bases in the Indian Ocean or the intention to transform the ASEAN Pact into a military alliance. But can advances in European disarmament have any benefit for security in the whole of the world, if the arms race is escalated in other parts of the globe? It is furthermore hardly imaginable that the aim of destroying all nuclear weapons can be obtained if the USA expands its network

of military bases around the socialist countries instead of dismantling it.

This is why the socialist countries back up such proposals as the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. They regard the establishment of new military pacts in whatever part of the world as harmful and have reiterated their will in Bucharest to overcome the division of the world in opposing military blocs. The Warsaw Treaty and NATO could set an example by putting those Articles of their pacts out of force which allow for the admission of new members. This would at least be a gesture of good will, not adversely affecting the security of any side, but one with quite an appeal for other continents, too. Instead, the NATO forces hostile to détente redouble their efforts to incorporate Spain in the western military pact and thus to change the strategic situation on our continent, this being in contradiction to the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The creation of a South Atlantic Pact which is to comprise the racist South African state alongside several Latin American countries would likewise heighten tensions in Africa and Latin America and probably lead to a change in the world-wide military balance. Is it really so difficult to give up these and similar projects which do not provide more security and peace but render disarmament efforts throughout the world more complicated?

The socialist countries come out against such ambitions. They reaffirmed their preparedness in Bucharest to dismantle the organization of the Warsaw Treaty should NATO also be prepared to dissolve its pact at the same time. A first step in this direction could be the dismantling of the military organizations of the two pacts. We are convinced that this is a realistic proposal which, by the way, would not at all impair the cooperation of NATO countries in the political, economic or other spheres, as is very often argued. Even the strength of the national armies which add up to the military power of NATO would not be directly affected through the dissolution of the pact.

World-wide renunciation of force

Last but not least, our disarmament programme includes proposals covering the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations and the holding of a special session of the UN General Assembly exclusively devoted to questions of disarmament and representing the first step towards the convocation of a world disarmament conference. The United Nations Organization has in the meantime fixed the summer of 1978 as the date for the special session on disarmament. The two proposals complement each other and both indicate the universal character of the disarmament problem. Dis-

armament debates and resolutions have played an ever greater role at the sessions of the UN General Assembly over the past few years, but never before has the world organization, in the awareness of its great responsibility for the safeguarding and preservation of peace, laid down such comprehensive measures in connection with this key issue.

However, since every government and every country shares responsibility for peace—regardless of its size and geographical situation—a world treaty on the non-use of force and a world disarmament conference would be conducive to ending the arms race and bringing about universal disarmament.

The peace proposals of Bucharest all taken together show the socialist countries' systematic and comprehensive approach to the disarmament problem. At the same time, this programme can be complemented by any constructive proposal submitted by other countries and social forces. Such proposals are welcome, and we are prepared to enter into discussion.

Representatives of various social circles in capitalist and developing countries have already come out with constructive ideas on disarmament. The socialist countries think it now most important to make practical use of existing initiatives and arrive at binding and effective international agreements in the sphere of disarmament.

There might be people saying that this programme is all too comprehensive and that it would perhaps be advisable

to concentrate on one issue or on a small number of questions, to begin with. We are realistically-minded people and do not cherish the illusion that all points in this programme could be tackled or even realized immediately. The socialist countries do not advocate the "Everything or nothing theory" in the realm of disarmament. They hold that there are *many* ways leading to this aim and that every opportunity should be taken to make headway in the field of disarmament.

We think that there are objective conditions to implement everyone of these proposals within the shortest possible span of time. The necessary subjective conditions, the readiness of all governments concerned, the creation of an appropriate political climate, the overcoming of the resistance offered by certain forces against this proposal or another or against disarmament in general, however can only be brought about by way of political struggle, persuasion and discussion. This also depends on the mass of the people, on how they work for these aims and make use of all existing possibilities so as to enforce their aims against the resistance offered by the enemies of disarmament. ,

What can we do for disarmament?

Nobody can contest that ending the arms race and shifting over to gradual disarmament will provide the most secure guarantees for durable and really stable world peace. And if it was impossible in the past to free the world from weapons this was by no means the fault of the peoples and due to a lack of preparedness on their part to bring about disarmament. The causes for this must be sought in the interests of groupings of big capital which are small in number but mighty in terms of economic and political influence and profited from armament hoping to draw advantages from wars of aggression.

We have tried to describe and prove why and how the balance of power has changed in favour of the forces of peace. This is also the reason why we are convinced that disarmament is no longer a Utopia under current conditions but a quite realistic objective. And it is quite important to know which forces are allies in this struggle, which obstacles have to be overcome and where these obstacles are to be found.

The volume of arms expenditures

First I should like to mention a few facts on current arms expenditures: The respective figure for 1976 in the whole world added up to some 300,000 million dollars. NATO countries accounted for 155,000 million dollars. The member-countries of this pact increased their military spending by more than 50 per cent over the last six years. Experts from the US Department of Defence predict already now that by 1980 the USA alone will have a military budget as high as the 1976 armaments budgets of all NATO countries taken together. In contrast, the Soviet Union has reduced its military spending in four successive years, for instance that for 1977 by 200 million roubles.

The Soviet military budget for 1977 totals 17,200 million roubles and is thus considerably lower than that of the USA. These facts are usually concealed by the bourgeois press because they would disclose the real trends in the arms race. Only the Federal German paper "Süddeutsche Zeitung" wrote several months ago that the cutbacks in the Soviet arms spending were meant as a "political signal". But even in making this indication the paper was a rare exception among the bourgeois mass media. Who would raise objections against a political signal indicating country's preparedness for disarmament. When taking account of facts and ignoring slanderous statements one will very soon find out the driving forces behind the arms race.

Needless to stress that the remarkable difference in the

arms spending of the USA and the Soviet Union is largely due to the profit interests of armament trusts in the United States—a factor which is completely non-existent in socialism. The capitalist trusts do not sell their armaments on the “normal market”. The state is orderer and consumer at the same time. The influence which the armament lobby has on the state guarantees particularly high profits almost automatically, that is monopoly profits even in times of crises. That is why the armament trusts shrink from nothing so as to retain this influence and even expand it. That is why they invent, with the help of relevant propaganda apparatuses, all kinds of “necessities” and defence requirements with a view to sending up armament expenditures and, consequently, their profits. So nowadays people are largely aware of the fact that the road to disarmament does not evade the struggle with this military-industrial complex against whose influence on the country’s politics even the former US President Eisenhower had warned.

It is certainly no coincidence that immediately after the new President Carter had declared in his election campaign that he considered certain reductions in military expenditures possible a committee composed of big industrialists and generals was set up in the USA with the aim of advancing sharply the arms build-up. Together with inveterate anti-communists among journalists, in the secret services and similar bodies the military-industrial complex in the USA and in Western Europe who fear for

their privileges and profits form the "hard core" of the opponents of disarmament. The contacts and the influence of these enemies of disarmament and détente cover all spheres of social life, although it is only an infinitely small percentage of the population in the capitalist countries which belongs to this circle.

Can armament create new places of work?

Arms race proponents asserted over a certain period of time that they would more or less fulfil a social function in that they created jobs or secured these jobs in times of crises. But precisely the crisis of the last three years has proved that rapidly rising armament production has not prevented the unemployment rate from increasing all the time. The contrary is true. The arms race of the past few decades has substantially contributed towards destabilizing the economy even of the most powerful capitalist countries. It has increased the public debt and helped to bring about inflationary trends. Every dollar flowing into armament could be used far more reasonably for non-military, civilian purposes.

On 19 December 1976, the "New York Times" quoted from a study by Professor Fox, former Undersecretary of State in the US Department of the Army and now Professor at Harvard University, in which the author stated that

it is hardly to be doubted that dollars invested in the

armament industry create a smaller number of work places than those allocated for many a civilian purpose. According to estimates by the Labour Statistics Office of January 1975 one thousand million dollars spent on defence purposes created 51,000 places of work. With the same amount of money, so the office calculated, 60,000 jobs could be provided in public housing construction, 80,000 in the public health service and 136,000 in the sphere of vocational training.

Les Aspin, member of the US House of Representatives, proved that it would be possible to create at least 4.8 million additional places of work from the funds saved if the USA reduced its military budget to 40,000 million dollars.

Similar calculations were also made in other countries and brought similar results. In actual fact, the social aspect of the arms race consists in considerable burdens on the population, which weigh more heavily anyhow in times of economic depression.

Whose interests are harmed by anti-communism?

Many people in western countries today ask the question as to who gains from anti-communism. Doesn't rather apply what the well-known German writer Thomas Mann said, namely that anti-communism is the basic folly of our

century? Many people in western countries think about their attitude towards anti-communism. We deliberately speak of anti-communism and not of an attitude towards communists, as it is of secondary importance to which party a person is affiliated or what world outlook he adheres to when the safeguarding of peace is at stake. Disarmament is the most important objective for all peoples. Anti-communism is an ideology based on hatred against any progress and practised with the help of any kind of lie, slander and spiritual aggression. This ideology is by no means only directed against communists, but, more or less, against all those working for justice and peace on this earth. In the name of anti-communism Guernica was bombed, were hundreds of thousands of adherents of the Spanish Republic murdered, were the fascist concentration camps erected, was the Soviet Union attacked, the aggression against Vietnam started and the Pinochet regime in Chile established. In the 1950s and 1960s, social-democrats and bourgeois forces taking part in the world peace movement were defamed and discriminated against as "having fallen victim to the communist peace propaganda" for the only reason that their ideas of a secure peace were identical with those of the socialist countries.

Anti-communism always results in a struggle *against* peace. It is therefore harmful to social-democrats, Christians, trade unionists and the peoples of the young nation-states, to all those who for the solution of their social and

economic problems need nothing more urgently than peace and disarmament. And anti-communism is also harmful to those industrialists whose interests can be better guaranteed in a climate of détente, the gradual elimination of the arms race and the development of international trade.

The broad movement of peace forces

The broadest possible participation of all social sections in all countries throughout the world is the best platform for disarmament, with full equality for all participants being observed, however different their motives. The 1973 World Congress of Peace Forces and the World Forum of Peace Forces in January 1977 which both took place in Moscow have clearly shown that it is possible indeed to reach agreement on questions related to peace. In the autumn of 1973, the over 3,000 delegates to the World Congress from more than 100 countries, representatives of hundreds of parties, organizations, Churches and unions, the majority of whom had never before participated in such a peace congress declared in their final appeal:

“Although we hold different views on many questions we are all in agreement with regard to the most important issue: the necessity of banning war from human society.”

Many forums and discussions have been held since then at national and international levels, involving tens of thousands of people and dealing with the question of how the strength of the peoples can be rendered more effective in the interests of peace.

The Moscow World Forum of Peace Forces held in January 1977 marked the most recent climax in the movement for a world without war. This event was attended by over 500 participants from 120 countries, who represented 70 international and 220 national organizations and 90 different political parties, including socialist, social-democratic, communist, liberal, radical, religious and other parties, trade unions, youth and women's federations, national movements and international organizations such as the UN and UNESCO. The participants also included 80 ministers, senators and members of parliament. This event was thus another proof of the fact that the peace movement is assuming ever broader dimensions.

The World Forum lasted three days and was characterized by an open and frank discussion in the interests of enhancing the process of détente and making it universal in character, eliminating existing centres of conflict and tension by way of peaceful and just solutions, halting the arms race and shifting over to disarmament and encouraging the struggle for national liberation and social progress. Differing political views and ideological convictions did not hinder the participants in arriving at a

considerable measure of agreements in the questions that were dealt with.

As a result, the communique of the meeting invited all political parties, organizations and movements and the peace forces in general to join in the campaigns launched for the safeguarding of peace, stating:

“Mankind has no other choice; there is no alternative to international détente. Peaceful coexistence is the only reasonable and acceptable foundation for relations between the states, primarily in the age of nuclear weapons.”

Steps to make peace more secure

Several hundred million people have affixed their signatures to the 1975 Stockholm Appeal of the World Peace Council which calls upon all governments, parliaments, all peace and mass movements to join in a world-embracing campaign against the arms race. The significance and the attractive power of this appeal increases with every signature, especially those of large trade union organizations, influential parties, youth federations, scientific and other institutions.

The trade unions in many capitalist countries exert themselves to cut down unemployment and halt the deterioration of social benefits often caused by armament. The trade unions should try and gain the full support of the millions who are directly or indirectly affected, and

their slogans should reflect the connection existing between armament and unemployment to make it clear for everybody to see what possibilities will be opened up for the creation of new places of work, for higher real wages and social welfare benefits if the arms race is ended.

The neutral states of Europe have played an essential role in preparing the European security conference. During the war in Vietnam, the parliaments and governments of these countries called upon those guilty of the aggression to put an end to the blood-shed. It is also due to them that peace has prevailed in Indochina since 1975. And the word of states not involved in the arms race carries great weight to this day.

The mass media—the press, radio and television—share a great measure of responsibility in popularizing the idea of disarmament. Unfortunately, quite often the proponents of the arms race are given the floor in the media while the advocates of disarmament are given no opportunity to express their opinion. The champions of peace are not willing to put up with this state of affairs. The majority of people favours a genuine discussion of the best roads leading to disarmament.

All possibilities should be used

It is common knowledge that the struggle for peace is not confined to expressing one's commitment to the cause of, or publishing declarations in favour of peace, but makes

concrete action in many fields imperative. A great number of people, including Western countries, are today well aware of this fact.

Such concrete actions include plans of parliamentarians to set up committees in their chambers of deputies, which are meant specifically to deal with questions of disarmament and closely to cooperate with social forces in the respective countries.

Hundreds of national and international scientific and other congresses take place every year. Not a few doctors, engineers, biologists and scientists from all disciplines ask whether or not such congresses should be used for expressing one's opinion on a question concerning the whole of mankind, people of all trades and professions and every branch of science?

In several countries schoolbooks are still used that describe wars of aggression in detail and in an uncritical manner. Would it not be more advisable if books serving the education of the up-and-coming generation devoted more space to bringing up young people in a spirit of peace and disarmament?

There is also a direct connection between the struggle against the remnants of colonialism and for disarmament. The creation of nuclear-weapon free zones is conducive to world-wide disarmament. The elimination of the hotbed of war in the Middle East, a just solution to the Cyprus problem enhance the idea of disarmament as does the struggle against the establishment of new military bases.

This and many other considerations form part and parcel of the positive balance-sheet drawn up on the current movements in the world-wide struggle to safeguard peace and end the arms race.

Commenting on the world congress of social forces for disarmament held in Helsinki in September 1976, a journalist from the Federal Republic of Germany wanted to be ironical when saying that the participants in this congress intended to bring forth something like a "world-wide disarmament fever". This journalist made a correct statement, although unintentional. Quite so, the armament fever of those wanting to push the world back to the abyss of bellicose conflict must be countered by the untiring preparedness of those determined to help the essential commandment of our time win through: by a mass movement, or let us say, by a disarmament fever, with a view to translating the idea of a secure peace into reality.

The disarmament problem can be solved if all democratic forces and parties, all organizations and federations, communists, socialists and Christians are unanimous on this issue and if each and everybody joins in this effort. Solving this problem has long ceased to be a Utopia.

